Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/858,251	GULER ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	SIEGFRIED E. CHENCINSKI	3695
All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):		
(1) SIEGFRIED E. CHENCINSKI.	(3)	
(2) Atty. Ted McCullough.	(4)	
Date of Interview: 30 March 2010.		
Type: a)⊠ Telephonic b)□ Video Conference c)□ Personal [copy given to: 1)□ applicant 2)□ applicant's representative]		
Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d)		
Claim(s) discussed: <u>1 and 10</u> .		
Identification of prior art discussed: <u>N/A</u> .		
Agreement with respect to the claims f)⊠ was reached. g)□ was not reached. h)□ N/A.		
Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicant agreed to the examiner's proposed amendments for overcoming the requirements of 35 USC 101 by inserting "a computer" as the first limitation into claim 1 and, "by a computer" and "by the computer" into the first limitation and second limitation, respectively, of claim 10. (A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.) THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.		
1		